

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated December 2, 2005. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims Rejections

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Knowles et al.* (US Pat. No. 5,869,819). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The *Knowles* reference is a reference that is directed toward a system that is operable to embed a URL within a code. The Examiner has specifically stated as support for the rejection as follows:

... instructional code generated at the database location on the network defining an instruction to cause the user location to be connected to at least one predefined destination defined by the relationship stored in the relational database in association with the transmitted extracted product information (e.g., Col. 4, ln 55-60);

The Examiner specifically referred to the specification, beginning at Column 4, lines 55-60. This is part of paragraph that begins at line 48. This paragraph is set forth as follows:

Another object of the present invention is to provide a novel Web-based document tracking and management system, in which each printed document (e.g., brochure, drawing, 3-D objects or specimens, photograph, specification, blue-print, and the like) to be tracked and managed within the system is uniquely assigned and affixed with a printed URL-encoded bar code symbol that specifies (i.e., points to) a particular information storage location within an HTML-encoded relational database management system (RDBMS), realized on an [sic] Web-based information server located on the Internet or behind the corporate firewall of an HTTP-supporting Intranet.

Thus, the bar code is a URL-encoded bar code. There is no ability to control the user's system with information received from a machine-readable code that has no routing information contained therein.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

S/N 09/382,425

Atty. Dkt. No. PHL Y-24,734

This particular application specifically teaches away from the concept of utilizing codes with no routing information that need to be routed to a relational database in order to allow information to be related to a particular URL. This is described beginning at Column 19, line 25. As such, there is provided a page of information that resides at a static information storage location on a web page on an RTD Internet server. The relational database is merely information that is to be returned relating to that information. As such, there is routing information contained within the machine-readable code, and this routing information merely pulls up exact information associated with a particular item or package. As such, Applicant believes that this system teaches away from Applicant's present inventive concept, as defined by the amended claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection with respect to Claims 1-22.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PHLY-24,734 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant

/gmh/
Gregory M. Howison
Registration No. 30,646

GMH:jlh:sjg

P.O. Box 741715
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715
Tel: 972-479-0462
Fax: 972-479-0464
February 28, 2006

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE
S/N 09/382,425
Atty. Dkt. No. PHLY-24,734